

QUANTUM OSCILLATOR IN THE THERMOSTAT AS A MODEL IN THE THERMODYNAMICS OF OPEN QUANTUM SYSTEMS

A.D. Sukhanov*

Bogolyubov's Laboratory of Theoretical Physics
JINR, Dubna, Moscow Region, Russia. Tel. (7-095)5012272. E-mail:
ogol@oldi.ru

Аннотация

The quantum oscillator in the thermostat is considered as the model of an open quantum system. Our analysis will be heavily founded on the use of the Schroedinger generalized uncertainties relations (SUR). Our first aim is to demonstrate that for the quantum oscillator the state of thermal equilibrium belongs to the correlated coherent states (CCS), which imply the saturation of SUR at any temperature. The obtained results open the perspective for the search of some statistical theory, which unifies the elements of quantum mechanics and GDT; this in turn will give the foundation for the modification of the standard thermodynamics.

In the last decades the interest to the thermodynamics of open quantum systems raised greatly. To the number of these objects one should, e.g., attribute nano-objects in the conditions of ultra-low temperatures, the objects, revealing macroscopic quantum phenomena and the effects of Casimir and Unruh as well as quark-gluon plasma, models of early Universe and so on. Firstly, in these systems the significant role play the fluctuations of conjugated physical quantities and correlations between them. Further, there arises the necessity of simultaneous account for the quantum and thermal fluctuations, which are determined by the fundamental constants $\hbar$ and k_B .

However, no consistent theory for the description of such kind of objects exists at the moment. For many years on this role was quite reasonable

*This text was reported on the Bogoljubov conference at 4 September 2004, JINR, Dubna

pretended by the statistical mechanics Gibbs - von Neumann and the thermodynamics founded on it. But this approach appeared to be not always effective for the description of the open quantum systems. First of all, it was not possible within this approach to calculate accurately the Bekenstein - Hawking entropy for the black holes. Finally it has brought to the pessimistic conclusion: "The thermodynamics of the black holes gives some weighty arguments in favor of the far-reaching non-adequacy even of the generally accepted understanding of the sense of matter's "ordinary entropy"[1]. On the authoritative conference "Quantum limits of the Second Law"[2] was quite seriously raised the problem about the necessity of correction of thermodynamics laws - especially of the second and third ones - in the direction of significant account for the quantum effects. In particular, for the long time there are considerable doubts in the validity of the Third Law; the known form of this law follows from the statistical mechanics, according to which $S \rightarrow 0$ as $T \rightarrow 0$ for any objects.

The above arguments compel to search for the solution of problems of this kind some replacement for the traditional statistical mechanics. For many years in the physicist's public opinion there was formed the firm conviction that this approach is almost unique way of statistical description of nature; however, this is far from being correct. Even Lorenz [3] in his lectures meant the statistical theories in plural number; the same was written by Born [4] in connection with Einstein's works.

Fenyés [5] was the first who showed convincingly that there exist another statistical theories, which are principally different from the statistical mechanics. On the one hand, this is the traditional quantum mechanics and it's version in the form of the Nelson's stochastic mechanics [6], on the other hand - the generalized diffusion theory (GDT), founded on the Einstein - Fokker - Plank equation [7-9]; the last theory includes the theory of Brownian motion founded as long as Einstein [10]. At present time these theories are different from one another; moreover, every of these theories is, in turn, qualitatively different from the statistical mechanics. On the other hand, these theories are conceptually related to one another due to the significant role of fluctuations (and their correlations) between the conjugated physical quantities.

In this report we consider the quantum oscillator in the thermostat as the model of an open quantum system. Our analysis will be heavily founded on the use of the Schroedinger generalized uncertainties relations (SUR) [11], which are valid in both theories meant above. Our first aim is to demonstrate

that for the quantum oscillator the state of thermal equilibrium belongs to the correlated coherent states (CCS), which imply the saturation of SUR at any temperature. The obtained results open the perspective for the search of some statistical theory, which unifies the elements of quantum mechanics and GDT; this in turn will give the foundation for the modification of the standard thermodynamics.

In order to realize the fundamental cause of the qualitative difference between the statistical mechanics and GDT it is sufficient to consider the classical oscillator in the thermostat. In this case the Maxwell - Boltzmann distribution function in the phase space is of the form [12]:

$$f_{M-B}(q, p) = \frac{1}{2\pi\Delta q\Delta p} \exp\left\{-\frac{q^2}{2\Delta q^2} - \frac{p^2}{2\Delta p^2}\right\} = f_B(q)f_M(p), \quad (1)$$

where

$$\Delta q^2 = \frac{k_B T}{m\omega_0^2}; \quad \Delta p^2 = mk_B T. \quad (2)$$

Due to the multiplicative form of the function $f_{M-B}(q, p)$ the correlator of conjugated variables q and p

$$\sigma_{qp} \equiv \overline{(\Delta q \Delta p)} = 0. \quad (3)$$

From the Eq. (3) it follows that the SUR [13] at $T \neq 0$ is of the form of strong inequality

$$\Delta p \Delta q \equiv \frac{k_B T}{\omega_0} > \sigma_{qp} = 0. \quad (4)$$

At the same time due to Smoluchowski [14] (see also [15]) in GTD the density of the distribution in coordinate, or configuration, space (in the aperiodic regime at $t \gg \tau$) equals

$$\rho(q, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\Delta q^2}} \exp\left\{-\frac{q^2}{2\Delta q^2}\right\}, \quad (5)$$

where

$$\Delta q^2 = \frac{D_{dif}}{\omega_0} (1 - \exp\{-2Q^2 t/\tau\}); \quad Q = \omega_0 \tau; \quad 0 \leq Q \leq 1/2; \quad (6)$$

$$D_{dif} = \frac{k_B}{m\omega_0}. \quad (7)$$

As is well known, in the theory of Brownian motion the definition of the moment of the individual particle $p = m\dot{q}$, accepted in statistical mechanics, is invalid. Thus following Furth [16] and Fenyes [5] as a moment conjugated to the random coordinate q is by definition accepted the moment of the particles' flow (at $v_{macro} = 0$)

$$p \equiv mv_{dif} = m \frac{j_{dif}}{\rho} = \frac{m}{\rho} (-D_{dif} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial q}) = m D_{dif} \frac{q}{\Delta q^2}. \quad (8)$$

To the state of the thermal equilibrium there corresponds the limit $t \rightarrow \infty$ at $Q \neq 0$, when

$$\Delta q^2 = \frac{D_{dif}}{\omega_0}. \quad (9)$$

In the same state

$$\Delta p^2 = (m D_{dif})^2 \frac{\Delta q^2}{(\Delta q^2)^2} = m^2 \omega_0 D_{dif}; \quad (10)$$

$$\sigma_{qp} = \overline{\Delta q \Delta p} = m \int dq \quad q j_{dif}(q) = m D_{dif}. \quad (11)$$

It follows from here that SUR in GTD are of the form of equality

$$\Delta p \Delta q \equiv \frac{k_B T}{\omega_0} = \sigma_{qp} \equiv m D_{dif} = \frac{k_B T}{\omega_0}. \quad (12)$$

This denotes that the state, described by the function $\rho(q, t)$ of the form (5) at $Q \neq 0$ and $t \rightarrow \infty$ is the CCS state. Note that for the free Brownian particle when $\omega_0 = 0$, one obtains the analogous result, but ω_0 should be replaced by $1/\tau$ [16].

It is not difficult to note that the expressions for Δq^2 and Δp^2 in the state of thermal equilibrium (and hence the left-hand sides of SUR in both statistical theories considered above) coincide. Accordingly coincide in form also the limiting function $\rho(q)$ and it's Fourier-transform $\rho(p)$ with the functions $f_B(q)$ and $f_M(p)$. However the expressions for the correlators σ_{qp} and thus the right-hand sides of SUR in them are qualitatively different.

From these arguments there follow some important conclusions:

- statistical mechanics differs from GTD in the definition of the conjugated moment. In the former theory p and q are independent, whereas in the latter - dependent ones;
- the cancellation of the quantity σ_{qp} in the statistical mechanics means that in this theory the diffusion is fully neglected ($D_{dif} = 0$);
- in turn, this means that in the statistical mechanics there is not accounted for the diffusion flow j_{dif} , caused by the non-uniform coordinate distribution which is brought about due to presence of the fluctuations ($\Delta q^2 \neq 0$).

In other words, the statistical mechanics doesn't give the consecutive description of the Nature, where three second-order moments Δp^2 , Δq^2 and σ_{qp} would be considered at the same rights.

In order to more convenient comparison with the classical variants of the theories let us use as the version of quantum mechanics the Nelson's stochastic mechanics; accordingly, in quantum statistics we will go out from the Wigner function [17]. According to Nelson, with the wave function in coordinate representation $\phi(q) = \sqrt{\rho(q)} \exp\{i\varphi(q)\}$ one may associate two velocities defined by the gradients of the phase $\varphi(q)$ and density $\rho(q)$ in the following way:

$$v_{qu} = \frac{\hbar}{m} \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial q} = 2D_{qu} \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial q}; \quad u_{qu} = -D_{qu} \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial q}, \quad (13)$$

where $D_{qu} \equiv \frac{\hbar}{2m}$ is usually called quantum diffusion coefficient. From these two quantities just the v_{qu} enters the continuity equation, so physically this quantity is related to the velocity v_{dif} in GDT. Taken formally, the velocity v_{dif} is more similar to the quantity u_{qu} , but actually the former is a truly

quantum quantity, connected with the non-commutativity of the operators $\hat{p}$ and $\tilde{q}$.

Further analysis is founded on the fact that as a conjugated moment is introduced (by definition) [13] the complex quantity $\tilde{P}$, which combines the contributions of both velocities of the form (13)

$$\tilde{P} \equiv m(v_{qu} + iu_{qu}). \quad (14)$$

Then

$$\Delta p^2 = |\overline{\Delta \tilde{P}^2}| = \overline{(mv_{qu})^2} + \overline{(mu_{qu})^2}; \quad (15)$$

$$\left[\overline{|\tilde{R}_{qp}|} \right]^2 = \sigma_{qp}^2 + c_{qp}^2 = m^2 \{ [\overline{qv_{qu}}]^2 + [\overline{qu_{qu}}]^2 \}. \quad (16)$$

Here σ_{qp} and c_{qp} are the contributions of anticommutator and of commutator of the operators $\hat{q}$ and $\hat{p}$ accordingly (in the scopes of traditional quantum mechanics), whereas $\tilde{R}_{qp}$ is the generalized complex correlator entering the right-hand side of SUR [13].

For the quantum oscillator in CCS the wave function is of the form [13]

$$\psi(q) = \frac{1}{(2\pi\Delta q^2)^{1/4}} \exp\left\{-\frac{q^2}{4\Delta q^2}(1 - i\alpha)\right\}, \quad (17)$$

where α is the parameter fixing the particular CCS. In accordance with the Eqs. (14) and (13) it holds for this state

$$\tilde{P} = \frac{mq}{\Delta q^2}(D_{qu}\alpha) + i\frac{mq}{\Delta q^2}D_{qu}. \quad (18)$$

For the oscillator the contribution into v_{qu} from the motion of the wave packet is absent; correspondingly,

$$\left[\overline{|\tilde{R}_{qp}|} \right]^2 = m^2[(D_{qu}\alpha)^2 + D_{qu}^2]. \quad (19)$$

Using further Eqs. (15) and (18), we obtain as a SUR the equality; indeed, as was awaited for CCS, the given form of SUR is saturated:

$$\Delta p^2 \Delta q^2 = \left[\overline{|\tilde{R}_{qp}|} \right]^2 = m^2 D_{qu}^2 (\alpha^2 + 1). \quad (20)$$

Recall, that in the ground state (when CCS goes over into CS) the parameter $\alpha = 0$, so that

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta q^2 &= \frac{D_{qu}}{\omega_0}; \quad \Delta p^2 = m^2 \omega_0 D_{qu}; \\ \sigma_{qp} &= 0; \quad |\widetilde{R}_{qp}| = c_{qp} = m D_{qu} = \frac{\hbar}{2}.\end{aligned}\tag{21}$$

Thus, as concerns the form of SUR, the oscillator in quantum mechanics appears to be analogous on the classical oscillator in GDT when $t \gg \tau$. All the difference consists in the fact that the right-hand side of SUR in the second case is ensured exclusively on account of σ_{qp} whereas in the second case this goal is achieved only by means of both contributions – σ_{qp} as well as c_{qp} . In fact, this signifies that in quantum mechanics as well as in GDT the conjugated quantities – coordinate and momentum – are mutually dependent. In this case the difference is only that this dependence in terms σ_{qp} appears always in explicit form. On the other hand, in the term c_{qp} in the traditional formulation of quantum mechanics this mutual dependence is implicit: it becomes explicit only in the framework of the statistical mechanics.

The analysis carried above has shown that the accepted definitions of the conjugated momenta lead to the following results:

Classical GDT ($T \gg 0$)	Quantum Mech. in CS ($T = 0$)	Quantum Mech. in CCS ($T \geq 0$)
$\Delta p^2 \Delta q^2 = (m D_{dif})^2$	$\Delta p^2 \Delta q^2 = (m D_{qu})^2$	$\Delta p^2 \Delta q^2 = (m D_{qu})^2 (\alpha^2 + 1)$

Thus we obtain two limiting cases ($T \rightarrow 0$ and high T) and also the structure of the general expression for the right-hand side of SUR for the oscillator in CCS. The problem is to find such an expression for the parameter α which would correspond to the quantum oscillator in the state of thermal equilibrium at any values of T .

In order to solve this problem we use the fluctuation - dissipation theorem (FDT) following from most basic principles of quantum and statistical physics [12]. Applying this theorem to the coordinate fluctuations we obtain for it's dispersion the following expression:

$$\Delta q^2 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \alpha''(\omega) \left(\frac{\hbar}{2} \coth \frac{\hbar\omega}{2k_B T} \right) d\omega.\tag{22}$$

Let us emphasize that the function $\coth \frac{\hbar\omega}{2K_B T}$ entering Eq. (22) does not only belong to any specific oscillator but is a universal function for any systems and, moreover, for fluctuations of any physical quantities in these systems. All the specific information about the concrete system is contained in the imaginary part of the generalized susceptibility $\alpha''(\omega)$.

Let us define the generalized diffusion coefficient as follows:

$$D_{gen} \equiv D_{qu} \coth \frac{D_{qu}}{D_{dif}} = \sqrt{D_{term}^2 + D_{qu}^2}. \quad (23)$$

This quantity characterises the diffusion flow due to the non-uniformity in the coordinate distribution, which arises on account of the quantum as well as the thermal effects. Here

$$D_{term} \equiv \frac{D_{qu}}{\sinh \frac{D_{qu}}{D_{dif}}} \quad (24)$$

is the thermal part of the generalized coefficient D_{gen} , depending both upon $\hbar$ and k_B , while at $T \rightarrow 0$ the coefficient $D_{term} \rightarrow 0$, whereas at high T the coefficient $D_{term} \rightarrow D_{dif}$ has the form (7). On account of the definition (23) FDT for the fluctuation of the coordinate may be presented in the form

$$\Delta q^2 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \alpha''(\omega) m D_{gen}(\omega) d\omega \quad (25)$$

which emphasizes the rigid connection between the characteristic of fluctuation Δq^2 and the generalized diffusion coefficient D_{gen} . For the oscillator with weak damping

$$\alpha'' = \frac{1}{|\tilde{\gamma}|} \delta(\omega - \omega_{eff}) = \frac{1}{m\omega} \delta(\omega - \omega_{eff}) \quad (26)$$

where $\omega_{eff} = \sqrt{\omega_0^2 + 1/\tau^2} \approx \omega_0$, so as $\Delta q^2 = D_{gen}/\omega_0$ what obviously generalizes Eqs. (2) and (9). Note that in reverse limit $1/\tau \gg \omega_0$ from Eqs. (25) and (26) follows the well known Einstein relation for the free Brownian particle

The problem of quantum oscillator in the framework of statistical mechanics was firstly solved by Bloch [18]; later on the original solutions of this problem were also found by Landau and Lifshitz [12], Leontovich [19] and

Feynman [20]. In sake of simplicity let us use the Wigner function obtained on the grounds of the Gibbs' density operator:

$$\hat{\rho}_G = \frac{\exp\{-\hat{H}/k_B T\}}{Sp \left(\exp\{-\hat{H}/k_B T\} \right)} \quad (27)$$

with the operator $\hat{H} = \frac{\hat{p}^2}{2m} + \frac{m\omega_0^2 \hat{q}^2}{2}$ for the case of oscillator

$$W(q, p) = \frac{1}{2\pi\Delta q\Delta p} \exp\left\{-\frac{q^2}{2\Delta q^2} - \frac{p^2}{2\Delta p^2}\right\}, \quad (28)$$

where

$$\Delta q^2 = \frac{D_{gen}}{\omega_0}; \quad \Delta p^2 = m^2\omega_0 D_{gen}. \quad (29)$$

Note that the expression (28) reminds in form the Maxwell - Boltzmann distribution with the substitution of D_{dif} for D_{gen} in Eq. (29). In analogy with the Eq. (1) from the Eq. (28) it follows that

$$\rho(q) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\Delta q^2}} \exp\left\{-\frac{q^2}{2\Delta q^2}\right\}; \quad \rho(p) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\Delta p^2}} \exp\left\{-\frac{p^2}{2\Delta p^2}\right\}. \quad (30)$$

As is well known, the limiting expressions for these quantities at $T \rightarrow 0$ or $T \gg 0$ go over accordingly into the probability densities of oscillator's ground state in q - or p - representations, or in the Boltzmann $f_B(q)$ or Maxwell $f_M(p)$ distribution functions.

It is easily seen that due to the multiplicativity of the Wigner function in this case one has $\sigma_{qp} = 0$. That's why at the arbitrary temperature in the framework of quantum statistical mechanics SUR for the oscillator obtains the form

$$\Delta p^2 \Delta q^2 \equiv (mD_{gen})^2 \geq \left[\overline{|\widetilde{R}_{qp}|} \right]^2 = c_{qp}^2 = \frac{\hbar^2}{4}. \quad (31)$$

The equality sign is only achieved here at $T = 0$; in the case of $T \neq 0$ just as in classical statistical mechanics SUR (31) has the form of the strong inequality

$$\Delta p \Delta q > \frac{\hbar}{2}. \quad (32)$$

This means that for the oscillator in the thermostat the single distinction in the descriptions in the frameworks both of the quantum and the classical statistical mechanics is connected with the account for the hidden mutual dependence between the conjugated coordinate and momenta. This dependence is brought about by the non-commutativity of the operators of corresponding variables which lead to the presence of the quantum fluctuations Δq^2 , characterizing the oscillator's ground state. However, the account for the mutually depending thermal and quantum fluctuations of the coordinate, which take place outside of the ground state, is absent both in quantum and classical forms of statistical mechanics.

The arguments presented above lead to the conclusion, that for the adequate description of the quantum oscillator in the thermostat the quantum statistical mechanics is to a large extent invalid. One should choose another variant of the theory, which allows to account simultaneously for quantum and thermal effects and uses for this goal the earlier obtained generalized diffusion coefficient D_{gen} of the form (23). It seems that arising difficulties are the result of the non-consequent account for the influence of the thermostat on the oscillator, namely of the infinite degrees of freedom by the thermostat.

This remark make us arrive to the notion to go over to the description of the considered open quantum system in the framework of the quantum field theory at finite temperatures (this theory is now rather actively used in many applications).

There exist two most elaborated versions of this theory:

- - the version, founded on the temperature Green functions and the imaginary time (Matsubara [21]);
- - the version, founded on the Thermo Field Dynamics (TFD) with the real time (Araki [22], Umezawa [23, 24]).

The first of these versions was especially popular thus far; however, it is not suited for the use of causal Green functions which form the foundation of the quantum field theory at $T = 0$, what prevents the uniform description of physical phenomena at arbitrary temperatures. Besides this formal circumstance the TFD is of interest because it is largely founded on the three fundamental ideas of Bogoluybov - namely, his (u, v) -transformation, method of quasiaverages and the description of the spontaneous violation of symmetry.

The main physical idea of TFD consists in the following: the placing of the system in the thermostat (or, more precisely, bringing them in the state of the thermal contact with one another) is effectively equivalent to

the doubling of the system's degrees of freedom, which in turn leads to the removal of the degeneration of the system. The influence of the thermostat manifests itself in the fact that instead of one way there arise effectively two independent ways of the absorption of the external energy by the system.

These two ways are the following ones: the first is the ordinary appearance of the excitation of new quanta of energy, while the second is the disappearance of the vacancies, which were "induced" in the system's spectrum under the influence of the thermostat at $T \neq 0$. In this case both annihilation $\tilde{a}$ and creation $\tilde{a}^+$ operators perform two independent operations (instead of one at $T = 0$), so these operators may be represented by the linear combination of another operators $b_i, b_j^+ (i, j = 1, 2)$:

$$\tilde{a} = ub_1 + vb_2^+; \quad \tilde{a}^+ = u^*b_1^+ + v^*b_2^+ \quad (33)$$

with $|u|^2 + |v|^2 = 1$. This combination is the typical Bogoluybov (u, v) -transformation, where

$$u = \cosh \tau \exp(i\varphi); \quad v = \sinh \tau \exp(-i\varphi) \quad (34)$$

at $0 \leq \tau < \infty, -\pi \leq \varphi \leq \pi$

The operators b_i, b_i^+ characterize the original particles and act in Fock space with the vacuum $|0\rangle$. The operators $\tilde{a}^+$ and $\tilde{a}$ characterize the quasiparticles and act in another Fock space with the vacuum $|\tilde{0}\rangle$ which is temperature dependent and possess the property $\tilde{a}|\tilde{0}\rangle = 0$. The vector $|\tilde{0}\rangle$ is orthogonal to all vectors of the original Fock space and so it doesn't belong to this space. In other words, the transformation (33) is the canonical one, but in this case it leads to the unitary non-equivalent representation of the canonical commutation rules (CCR), because the thermostat is the system with infinitely many degrees of freedom.

The main axiom of TFD comes in fact from the idea of the method of quasiaverages: there is suggested that the original ground state $|0\rangle$ is unstable relative to the perturbation created by the thermostat. That's why it is assumed that the average of the number operator of quasiparticles $\tilde{a}^+\tilde{a}$ at the temperature $T \neq 0$ over the original Fock vacuum $|0\rangle$ is equal to the average of the number operator of original particles a^+a at $T = 0$ over the Gibbs distribution with temperature $T \neq 0$, i.e. calculated in the framework of quantum statistical mechanics:

$$\langle 0|\tilde{a}^+\tilde{a}|0\rangle \equiv Sp (a^+ a \hat{\rho}_G) \quad (35)$$

where the density operator $\hat{\rho}_G$ depends upon $\hat{H} = \hbar\omega_0(a^\dagger a + 1/2)$.

From the axiom meant above it is not difficult using the Eqs. (33) and (34) to obtain the relation between the parameters of Bogoluybov transformation and the temperature of the thermostat:

$$\sinh^2 \tau = \frac{1}{\exp \frac{\hbar\omega_0}{k_B T} - 1} = \frac{1}{2} \coth \frac{D_{gen}}{D_{dif}} - \frac{1}{2} \quad (36)$$

and analogously for $\cosh^2 \tau$.

The obtained relation (36) allows to fix ultimately the quantity α , which defines the phase of the oscillator wave function in CCS in the presence of thermostat. If one puts $\varphi = \pi/4$ in the general expressions for Δq^2 and Δp^2 and then use the Eqs. (36) and (23), one obtains

$$\Delta q^2 = \frac{l_0^2}{2} \cosh 2\tau = \frac{D_{gen}}{\omega_0}; \quad \Delta p^2 = m^2 \omega_0 D_{gen}; \quad (37)$$

$$\alpha = \sinh 2\tau = \frac{1}{\sinh \frac{D_{qu}}{D_{dif}}}; \quad \sigma_{qp} = m D_{qu} \alpha = \frac{m D_{qu}}{\sinh \frac{D_{qu}}{D_{dif}}} = m D_{term}. \quad (38)$$

It follows from these relations that for the oscillator in TFD the SUR possess the form of equality

$$\Delta p^2 \Delta q^2 = \sigma_{qp}^2 + c_{qp}^2 = (m D_{term})^2 + (m D_{qu})^2 = (m D_{gen})^2, \quad (39)$$

what naturally corresponds to the limiting cases (12) and (20) (at the condition $\alpha = 0$).

It can also be shown that Wigner function in this case is equal to the following expression:

$$W(q, p) = \frac{1}{\pi \hbar} \exp \left\{ - \left[\frac{q^2}{2\Delta q^2} + \frac{p^2}{2\Delta p^2} \right] \coth \frac{D_{qu}}{D_{dif}} - \frac{qp}{\Delta q \Delta p} \frac{1}{\sinh \frac{D_{qu}}{D_{dif}}} \right\}. \quad (40)$$

This function is not multiplicative in the arguments q and p what reveals the mutual statistical dependence of these arguments, and it is this dependence

which leads to the correlator σ_{qp} . Exactly the same result may be obtained [24] in another way, namely by the direct account for the interrelation between the operators b_1 and b_2 , which arise due to the following fact: the quasiparticle vacuum $|0\rangle\rangle$ contains the condensate consisting from the pairs of particles.

Let us formulate some conclusions.

1. SUR (38) may be presented in the following form:

$$\Delta p \Delta q = \frac{\hbar}{2} \coth \frac{\hbar \omega_0}{2k_B T} \equiv \frac{\hbar^*}{2}. \quad (41)$$

In other words, for the oscillator in the thermostat the role of the effective quantum of action plays the quantity $\hbar^* \geq \hbar$, which grows with growing temperature. The limiting values of this quantity are $\hbar$ (at $T \rightarrow 0$) and $2k_B T / \omega_0$ (at $T \gg 0$).

2. The phase of the wave function for CCS of the oscillator in the thermostat depends upon the temperature

$$\varphi_{dif} = \varphi - \varphi_0 = \frac{q^2}{4\Delta q^2} \alpha = \frac{q^2}{2l_0^2} \frac{1}{\cosh \frac{D_{qu}}{D_{dif}}}. \quad (42)$$

At $T \rightarrow 0$ the phase $\varphi \rightarrow 0$ ($\sigma_{qp} \rightarrow 0$), at $T \gg 0$ the phase $\varphi_{dif} \rightarrow q^2 / 2l_0^2 \neq 0$ ($\sigma_{qp} \rightarrow m D_{dif} = k_B T / \omega_0$). The last relation means that the role of the phase of the wave function is preserved also in traditionally classical region thus ensuring the existing of the thermal diffusion in the classical limit.

3. In the given case CCS is characterized by the wave function and so this state is a pure one; on the other hand, the parameters of this wave function and the corresponding correlator σ_{qp} depend upon the temperature and thus reveal the presence of the thermal noise in this state [24]. The calculation of the entropy (defined according to von Neumann) for the oscillator in CCS gives $S = 0$ at any temperature. This contradiction makes very actual the question of the more correct definition of the entropy, which should be able to account for the thermal noise in CCS.

4. For the subsequent generalization of thermodynamics it is useful to introduce the notion of the generalized temperature [25]. Let us define the following temperatures

$$T_{gen} \equiv T_{qu} \coth \frac{T_{qu}}{T}; \quad T_{qu} \equiv \frac{\hbar \omega}{2k_B}. \quad (43)$$

Evidently, at high temperatures $T_{gen} \rightarrow T$, but at $T \rightarrow 0$ we have $T_{gen} \rightarrow T_{qu} \neq 0$, what corresponds to the generalization of the Third Law. Note that T_{qu} is the characteristic of those mode of normal vacuum vibrations which is in the resonance to the considered oscillator.

5. It is interesting to compare SUR "coordinate - momentum" with the earlier obtained SUR "energy - frequency" and "energy - temperature" for the oscillator in CCS in the thermostat, which are expressed by the aid of the generalized temperature [26]

$$\Delta p \Delta q = \frac{\hbar T_{gen}}{2 T_{qu}} = \frac{k_B}{\omega} T_{gen}; \quad (44)$$

$$\Delta \mathcal{E} \Delta \left(\frac{1}{T_{gen}} \right) = k_B. \quad (45)$$

Note that in Eq. (44) the quantities T_{gen} and T_{qu} relate to the surrounding (i.e., the thermostat) and so don't fluctuate. On the contrary, in Eq. (45) all quantities relate to the system and so do fluctuate.

6. The comparison of the descriptions of the oscillator in the thermostat in the frameworks of the quantum statistical mechanics and TFD reveals that the expressions for $\rho(q)$, $\rho(p)$, Δq^2 and Δp^2 in these theories coincide completely. However, the Wigner function and correlators σ_{qp} in these theories differ due to the difference of the definitions of the conjugate momentum; it is just this difference which leads to qualitatively forms of SUR. Note that this difference is preserved also in quasiclassical limit ($\hbar \rightarrow 0$), what is important for the theory of Brownian motion. Namely, it denotes that the traditional opinion about the equivalence of the variants of this theory - i.e., based on the Langevin equation (statistical mechanics) and based on the Einstein - Fokker - Planck equation (GDT) - needs some corrections.

7. The analysis carried above has also shown that the further development of TFD [23, 24] is the most perspective direction of search for the effective generalization of thermodynamics on the quantum systems at ultralow temperatures, where the role of both quantum and thermal fluctuations becomes significant. There is urgent need for the more consistent spreading of the seminal ideas of the quantum field theory on various thermal phenomena and ideas of the thermodynamics on any quantum open systems. It can be hoped that this way may just lead to the complete realization of the concept of the physics as a "single whole" science.

1. Bekenstein J.D. Quantum Black Holes as Atoms. gr-qc/9901033 v.1
2. Quantum Limits of Second Law. Ed. D.P. Sheehan, AIP, San-Diego, 2002
3. Lorentz H.A. Les Theories Statistiques en Thermodynamique. Leipzig-Berlin, Teubner, 1916.
4. Born M. Einstein's statistical theories. Albert Einstein: Philosopher-Scientist, ed. P.A. Schilpp, N. Y., Tudor, 1949, p. 163
5. Fényes I. Zs. Phys. 132, 81, 1952
6. Nelson E. Phys.Rev. 150, 1079, 1966; Dynamical Theories of Brownian Motion. Princeton. Univ Press, Princeton, 1967
7. Einstein A. Ann. Phys. 19, 371, 1906.
8. Fokker A.D. Ann. Phys., 43, 810, 1914;
9. Plank M. Sitzungsber. Akad. Wiss., 324, 1917
10. Einstein A. Ann. Phys. 17, 549, 1905.
11. Schrödinger. Ber. Kgl. Akad. Wiss. Berlin, 1930, S. 296
12. Landau L.D. Lifshitz E.M. Statistical Physics P. I. Oxford, Pergamon (1980)
13. Sukhanov A.D. Theor. and Math. Physics, 132(3), 1277,2002
14. Smoluchowski M. Bull. Intern de l'Ac. de Sciences de Cracovie. (A), 418, 1913
15. Ansel'm A.I. Foundations of Statistical Physics and Thermodynamics (in Russian) M., Nauka, 1973. M., Hayka, 1973
16. Furth R. Zs. Phys. 81, 143, 1933
17. Wigner E. Phys.Rev. 40,749 (1932)
18. Bloch F. Z.Phys. 74,295 (1932)

19. Leontovitch M.A. Introduction to Thermodynamics. Statistical Physics (in Russian) M., Nauka. Phymathlit, 1983
20. Feinman R. Statistical Mechanics. Massachusetts, Benjamin Inc. 1972
21. Matsubara T. Prog. Thor. Phys. 14, 351 (1955)
22. Shwinger J. J.Math. Phys. 2, 407 (1961); Келдыш Л.В. ЖЭТФ, 47, 9, 1515 (1964)
23. Umezawa H, Matsumoto H. Tachiki M. Thermo Field Dynamics and Condensed States. North-Holl. Publ. Amsterdam, 1982
24. Umezawa H. Physica A. 158, 1, 306 (1989); Advanced Field Theory Micro, Macro and Thermal Physics. N.Y. AIP 1993
25. Sukhanov A.D. On the Global Interrelation between Quantum Dynamics and Thermodynamics. Proc. of XI Intern. Conf. "Problems of Quantum Field Theory". 1998. Dubna, 1999. P. 232
26. Sukhanov A.D. Theor. and Math. Physics, 125, (2), 1489, 2000;